DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 609 CE 039 850

TITLE Evaluation of the Transition Program Implementation (TPI): Shared-Time, 1983-84.
INSTITUTION District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, DC. Div. of Quality Assurance.
PUB DATE Oct 84
NOTE 45p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperative Planning; *Cooperative Programs; *Dual Enrollment; Educational Planning; *High Schools; High School Students; *Institutional Cooperation; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Shared Services; Vocational Education; *Vocational Schools; Vocational Training Centers

ABSTRACT

The Transition Plan for a Career Development Program was developed as a plan for phasing in the career development concept, including its shared-time features, in the Washington, D.C. public schools. Shared-time is a scheduling process that allows students to attend a comprehensive high school for academic courses and a career development center for vocational/technical courses. After the plan had been implemented, data were gathered via selected interviews; questionnaires sent to selected administrators, counselors, teachers, students and parents; and analysis of students' comprehensive high school grades and absences from class. The results of the study were the following: (1) the modernization of the career development centers has largely been completed and was seen as successful by various participants; (2) counselors played a large role in providing information about the program to students and parents and in the recruitment of students; (3) generally, students, teachers, and parents had positive opinions about the quality of the course offerings; (4) the most serious problems of the program were associated with shared-time scheduling; (5) tenth-grade shared-time students outperformed their colleagues who were not in the program in all academic areas except social studies; and (6) in general, the academic performance and attendance rates of the program participants were as good or better than those of students who did not participate in shared time. Recommendations were made for improved scheduling to eliminate coordination problems and provide more time for students to take required courses, and continued discussion between the high schools and career centers to work out problems as they arise. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED251609

CE

Evaluation Of The Transition Program Implementation (TPI): Shared-Time, 1983-84

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M Cooper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Floretta Dukes McKenzie
Superintendent of Schools
Chief State School Officer
October 1984

CE039857

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Evaluation of the Transition Program Implementation (TPI): Shared-Time 1983-84

Prepared by
Division of Quality Assurance
October 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
SUMMARY	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODS	2
III. FINDINGS	5
A. Recruitment of Students	5
B. Guidance and Counseling	6
C. Modernization Program	9
D. Curriculum/Instruction	10
E. Staff Development	12
F. Staffing and Support	14
G. Scheduling	15
H. Academic Performance	16
1. Grade Ten	16
2. Grade Eleven	18
3. Grade Twelve	18
I. Attendance	18
1. Grade Ten	20
2. Grade Eleven	20
3. Grade Twelve	20
J. Parents' Opinions and Community Involvement	20
IV. CONCLUSIONS	23

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

APPENDICES

A. Evaluation Design 27

B. Preliminary Report Based on Interviews and Observation 33

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Evaluation Questionnaires Distributed and Received, by School and Source of Information	3
2.	Counselors' Opinions of the Extent to Which Their Schools' Career-Counseling Programs Provide Different Components	7
3.	Teachers' Evaluations of School and Program Components, by CDC and CHS Respondents	8
4.	Shared-Time Students' Evaluations of School and Program Components in Their CDC and CHS Buildings	9
5.	Frequency of Use of Different Instructional Methods in CDC Program/Courses, as Rated by Shared-Time Students	11
6.	CDC and CHS Counselors' Evaluations of Aspects of the Instructional Program at Their Respective Schools	13
7.	Number and Percent of CDC (Shared-Time) and CHS (Non-Shared Time) Students Passing or Failing Five Required Courses in the Fourth Advisory, by Grade	17
8.	Number and Percent of CDC (Shared-Time) and CHS (Non-Shared Time) Students' Absences in the Fourth Advisory, by Course and Grade	20
9.	Parents' Assessments of Their Child's CDC and CHS	21
10.	Parents' Opinions of Their Child's Shared-Time Program	22

SUMMARY

Program: Transition Program Implementation (TPI): Shared-Time, 1983-84

Schools: Career Development Centers (CDC) - Bell, Burdick, Chamberlain Penn Center, Phelps and M.M. Washington

Comprehensive High Schools (CHS) - Anacostia, Cardozo, Coolidge, Dunbar, Eastern, McKinley, Roosevelt and Spingarn

Target Population: Tenth, eleventh and twelfth grade students on shared-time (attending one-half day in a CDC and one-half day in a CHS)

Major Results:

1. The modernization of the career development centers has largely been completed and was seen as successful by various participants.
2. Counselors played a large role in providing information about TPI to students and parents and in the recruitment of students.
3. Generally, students, teachers and parents had positive opinions about the quality of the CDC course offerings.
4. The most serious problems of TPI were associated with shared-time scheduling.
5. Tenth grade shared-time students out performed their colleagues who were not in the program.
6. In general, the academic performance and attendance rates of CDC students were as good or better than that of students who did not participate in shared-time.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Transition Plan for a Career Development Program (senior high level) was developed in response to a request from the Board of Education to the Superintendent of Schools to formulate a plan for phasing in the career development concept, including its shared-time features. Shared-time is a scheduling process that allows students to attend a comprehensive high school (CHS) for academic courses and a career development center (CDC) for vocational/technical courses.

The Transition Program Implementation (TPI) objectives and evaluation questions (See Appendix A) addressed in this report pertain especially to shared-time. Because of this and due to the fact that the majority of the school personnel refer to TPI as shared-time, the terms are used synonymously in this report. Shared-time students and CDC students are also used synonymously.

In the shared-time program implemented systemwide in September 1983, all senior high school students were registered in a comprehensive high school for enrollment accountability and to receive their academic courses. Students who wished to pursue vocational/technical training were assigned and scheduled to attend one of the career development centers for one-half day, morning or afternoon.

The schools involved in this study were six career development centers (Bell, Burdick, Chamberlain, Penn Center, Phelps and M. M. Washington) and eight comprehensive high schools (Anacostia, Cardozo, Coolidge, Dunbar, Eastern, McKinley, Roosevelt and Spingarn).

II. METHODS

Several methods of information gathering and analysis were employed in this evaluation.

First, selected interviews were conducted. Results of those have been published and disseminated in a preliminary report. See Appendix B.

Second, questionnaires were sent to: the administrators and supervising directors of the Division of Career Development Program; ten members of the Local Advisory Council on vocational education; CDC and CHS principals, counselors and samples of teachers; samples of CHS tenth grade students not on shared-time; and samples of CDC (on shared-time) tenth, eleventh and twelfth grade students and their parents. Table 1 shows the number of evaluation questionnaires distributed, and the number received back completed. Most of the present report is based on the quantitative and qualitative information obtained from the received questionnaires.

It is important for the reader to note that in compiling responses to quantitative questions, we did not try to differentiate among career development centers or comprehensive high schools. For example, in tabulating the responses of students to a question, we pooled all responses to obtain total frequencies and percentages. That procedure gave more weight to opinions from some schools than others, as can readily be seen in Table 1 by the differences in number of respondents. In effect, all opinions were treated as equally applicable to all environments. Evaluations uniquely applicable to particular environments were not considered in this report.

The third method of information gathering employed in the present evaluation applied to the analysis of students' comprehensive high school grades (marks) and absences from class. Data for these analyses were obtained from the Report Card System files of the Division of Information Resource Management. The lack of data

TABLE 1

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED AND RECEIVED, BY SCHOOL AND SOURCE OF INFORMATION

Schools/Sources	Principals			Counselors			Teachers			Students			Parents		
	Sent	Recd*	%	Sent	Recd*	%	Sent	Recd*	%	Sent	Recd*	%	Sent	Recd*	%
1. Career Development Centers															
Bell	1	0	0%	2	2	100%	16	16	100%	49	37	76%	49	5	10%
Burdick	1	1	100%	1	1	100%	24	24	100%	57	13	23%	57	8	14%
Chamberlain	1	1	100%	2	1	50%	20	9	45%	71	49	69%	71	37	52%
Penn	1	1	100%	3	2	67%	21	17	81%	46	16	35%	46	6	13%
Phelps	1	1	100%	2	1	50%	25	14	56%	53	29	55%	53	10	19%
M. M. Washington	1	1	100%	2	2	100%	23	16	70%	106	84	79%	106	12	11%
Total	6	5	83%	12	9	75%	129	96	74%	382	228	60%	382	78	20%
2. Comprehensive High Schools															
Anacostia	1	1	100%	5	2	40%	9	8	89%	**	10	**	N/A		
Cardozo	1	0	0%	4	4	100%	9	0	0%	**	5	**			
Coolidge	1	0	0%	3	3	100%	9	7	78%	**	7	**			
Dunbar	1	1	100%	4	1	25%	9	6	67%	**	18	**			
Eastern	1	1	100%	3	3	100%	9	8	89%	**	26	**			
McKinley	1	0	0%	5	0	0%	9	6	67%	**	7	**			
Roosevelt	1	0	0%	4	0	0%	9	0	0%	**	0	**			
Spingarn	1	1	100%	4	4	100%	9	7	78%	**	11	**			
Total	8	4	50%	32	17	53%	72	42	58%	**	86	**			
3. CDC Division Administrators/Directors	14	6	43%												
4. Local Advisory Council	10	1	10%												

* Recd. means completed form received back by the Division of Quality Assurance.

** 30-40 questionnaires were sent to selected homerooms, however, only tenth graders not attending a CDC were to complete one. Exact numbers of full-time tenth graders per selected homeroom were not known.

file availability and programming resources at the time of request for services, limited the mark and attendance analyses to the fourth quarter data for school year 1983-84.

As with the questionnaire data, the attendance and grade (mark) tabulations associated with different schools were combined to produce totals for the CHS involved. Since some comprehensive high schools had more students than others, they perforce contributed more heavily to the totals. Furthermore, when we grouped data into five major courses, we assumed that the courses within and among the different schools were equivalent. For example, we assumed that different science courses within a particular school at a particular grade level were equivalent to each other and to science courses at the same grade level in the other seven schools.

III. FINDINGS

A. Recruitment of Students

Most CDC counselors visited junior high schools to talk with students. Counselors also invited students for tours of the CDC, sent out brochures, flyers or letters, talked with parents and assisted in arrangements at career fairs.

Both CDC and CHS principals reported that assemblies were the main method used to make students aware of the shared-time program. Some also cited newsletters and flyers as methods used.

When asked to indicate the one source from which they found out about the shared-time program, students responded as follows (211 respondents):

Counselor	50%
Teacher	15%
Friend	15%
Parent	10%
Principal	5%
Student	4%
Printed announcements/handouts	1%

These sources of information were reported with about the same relative frequency by a sample of 10th grade students who were not in the shared-time program.

Counselors were a major source of recruitment information for students, with friend, parents and teachers also active forces. Students thought they had been provided with sufficient information about the program (87% of those in the program said "yes" and 64% of the CHS tenth graders not in the program said "yes").

It is of interest to note how the shared-time program was perceived by the

sample of CHS tenth grades that chose not to participate. They were asked: "Which statement best expresses your feeling about the shared-time program?" These were the results for 79 respondents:

- o It is a program for students who are mainly interested in a trade or business career (49.4%);
- o It is a program for students who may want to learn a trade and also acquire all the skills and academics necessary to attend college (48.1%); and
- o It is a program for students who are weak academically and are not college bound (2.5%).

The majority of the CHS tenth graders stated that counselors provided them with information about shared-time and that they were satisfied with their selection of being full-time at a CHS.

B. Guidance and Counseling

CDC and CHS counselors indicated a wide range of counseling services that they provided to students, teachers, and parents, individually and in group sessions. Their assessments of the career-counseling program in the two different types of schools were different, however, as Table 2 shows. In the opinion of CDC counselors, the career centers provided a more complete career-counseling program than CHS counselors perceived to be the case in their CHS schools.

CDC and CHS teachers and students were asked to evaluate the guidance and counseling services in their respective schools (see Tables 3 and 4).1/ CHS teachers were a little more likely than CDC teachers to rate the guidance and counseling good to excellent, although a majority in both types of schools gave that rating. The great

1/ Tables 3 and 4 contain teachers' and students' opinions about a number of CDC and CHS characteristics. They will be referred to as appropriate in a number of sections throughout this report.

TABLE 2

COUNSELORS' OPINIONS OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEIR SCHOOLS' CAREER-COUNSELING PROGRAMS PROVIDE DIFFERENT COMPONENTS

Components	School Type	Ratings Totally	To Some Extent	Not at All	N
1. A career plan established for each student	CDC	12.5%	87.5%	—	8
	CHS	—	83.3%	16.7%	12
2. A relevant, cooperative work experience for students	CDC	66.7%	33.3%	—	9
	CHS	15.4%	61.5%	23.1%	13
3. Proper placement for work and college-bound students	CDC	50.0%	50.0%	—	8
	CHS	—	92.3%	7.7%	13
4. Recruiting of new students	CDC	100.0%	—	—	9
	CHS	25.0%	58.3%	16.7%	12
5. Follow-up of graduates	CDC	62.5%	37.5%	—	8
	CHS	15.4%	69.2%	15.4%	13
6. Identification of potential dropouts	CDC	28.6%	71.4%	—	7
	CHS	—	76.9%	23.1%	13
7. Adequate follow-up on student referrals	CDC	37.5%	62.5%	—	8
	CHS	15.4%	69.2%	15.4%	13

majority of students on shared-time expressed satisfaction with the counseling received in their CDC and their CHS.

Some CDC students listed complaints about the counseling services. Comments were similar for both types of schools. The most frequent complaint was inability to get access to the counselor, followed by complaints about what was seen as unresponsiveness or unhelpfulness. A few students simply stated that they never heard of the counselor, or that no counseling was given.

TABLE 3

TEACHERS' EVALUATIONS OF SCHOOL AND PROGRAM COMPONENTS, BY CDC AND CHS RESPONDENTS

Components	School Type	Ratings: Poor to Fair	Ratings: Good to Excellent	N
1. Condition of building	CDC	19%	81%	95
	CHS	66%	34%	41
2. Condition of classrooms	CDC	14%	86%	95
	CHS	56%	44%	41
3. Equipment	CDC	28%	72%	93
	CHS	77%	23%	39
4. Library Facilities	CDC	22%	78%	94
	CHS	42%	58%	41
5. Quality of course offerings	CDC	9%	91%	90
	CHS	31%	69%	42
6. Student guidance/counseling	CDC	40%	60%	94
	CHS	29%	71%	42
7. Teacher interest in students	CDC	6%	94%	94
	CHS	7%	93%	42
8. Shop/laboratory facilities	CDC	24%	76%	96
	CHS	62%	38%	37
9. Food facilities	CDC	70%	30%	93
	CHS	32%	68%	40
10. Supplies	CDC	64%	36%	96
	CHS	65%	35%	40

TABLE 4

SHARED-TIME STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS OF SCHOOL AND PROGRAM COMPONENTS IN THEIR CDC AND CHS BUILDINGS

Component	School Type	Ratings: Very Dissatisfied to Somewhat Dissatisfied	Ratings: Somewhat Satisfied to Very Satisfied	N
1. Condition of building	CDC	10%	90%	221
	CHS	25%	75%	221
2. Condition of classrooms	CDC	10%	90%	219
	CHS	16%	84%	214
3. Equipment and facilities	CDC	16%	84%	219
	CHS	17%	83%	214
4. Quality of course/career offerings	CDC	12%	88%	213
Quality of academic instruction	CHS	13%	87%	215
5. Counseling received	CDC	21%	79%	213
	CHS	22%	78%	214
6. Teacher interest in students	CDC	15%	85%	220
	CHS	10%	90%	218

C. **Modernization Program**

A goal of TPI was to complete modernization of the career development centers. Modernization included renovations, new equipment and furnishings. Four of the five responding CDC principals were satisfied with the modernization that had been completed by mid-April 1984. The fifth principal responding, noted that only a bare minimum had been accomplished in his/her building.

CDC principals believed that modernization had helped the program in various ways. It had made the environment more attractive, increased enrollment capacity, and motivated students and teachers.

CDC teachers' evaluations of facilities and equipment tended to support the principals' opinions (see Table 3). Students' evaluations did also, as shown in

Table 4. In Table 3 it may be seen that CDC teachers were far more pleased than CHS teachers with their building and facilities.

When shared-time students compared their career centers and comprehensive high schools, they were more satisfied with the condition of their CDC building. They saw little comparative difference between CDC and CHS equipment and facilities. They were largely satisfied with those in both cases.

D. Curriculum/Instruction

How did participants assess the course offerings in the career centers? Teachers were asked to rate the quality of course offerings in their schools. Shared-time students were asked to rate their satisfaction with course/career offerings in their CDC, as well as with the quality of academic instruction in their CHS. The results for teachers are given in Table 3, for students in Table 4.

CDC Teachers were much more likely to rate their school's course offerings good to excellent than were CHS teachers (91% for CDC teachers, compared to 69% for CHS teachers). Students expressed satisfaction with the courses in both schools and did not think one was better or worse than the other (88% satisfied with CDC courses, compared to 87% satisfied with CHS courses).

Teachers' interest in students was rated high to an equal extent by CDC and CHS teachers. Students' ratings of teachers' interest were also high and quite similar for both schools attended.

CDC and CHS teachers rated availability of supplies fair to poor, as opposed to good to excellent, by a margin of nearly 2 to 1. In a separate question, responses of CHS teachers were more likely than CDC teachers to indicate that updated curriculum documents were available to them (73% for CHS, 57% for CDC).

In connection with curriculum, 87% of the CDC teachers, compared to 63% of the CHS teachers believed that the equipment provided them was relevant to the career goals of their students.

What did the shared-time students perceive themselves as doing in their career centers and how often? Table 5 shows answers to that question. The most frequent activities engaged in by students were: working in a shop/lab situation (54%); listening to a lecture (50%); and working on an individual project (48%). Nearly 90% of the students said they seldom or never visited a course-related work-site.

TABLE 5

FREQUENCY OF USE OF DIFFERENT INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS IN CDC PROGRAM/COURSES, AS RATED BY SHARED-TIME STUDENTS

Activity	Frequency of Engagement			N
	Never	Seldom	Often	
1. Listening to a lecture	8%	42%	50%	217
2. Participating in a student centered discussion	16%	44%	39%	216
3. Working in a shop/lab situation	30%	16%	54%	218
4. Working on an individual project	15%	37%	48%	215
5. Visiting a course-related work-site	49%	39%	13%	216

Shared-time students were asked: "Are you getting the kind of training you expected in your CDC and CHS?" More students answered **yes** for the CHS (91%) than for the CDC (79%). The reason for that may be that some students' career plans after graduation were not always linked to their CDC program, as the following responses about career plans show (210 shared-time students):

- o Get a job relative to my CDC program/course (44%);
- o Pursue advanced training relative to my CDC program/course (25%);
- o Pursue a higher education in an area other than my CDC choice (15%);

- o Become a career education teacher (1%); and
- o Other (15%).

A number of tenth grade students not in the shared-time program noted that they chose not to participate because their CDC did not offer training in a career of interest to them.

Finally CDC and CHS counselors were asked to evaluate their schools' curriculum on several dimensions of appropriateness. The opinions of those responding are shown in Table 6. As would be expected, CDC counselors were more positive about the career-oriented aspects of the CDC curriculum and instruction than CHS counselors were about career-oriented aspects in the CHS programs.

CHS counselors were more positive in ratings of their schools' programs in the areas of developing leadership and athletic skills and enabling students to continue their education than were CDC counselors.

E. Staff Development

Principals, teachers, counselors and CDC Supervising Directors were asked what kinds of staff development activities were provided to them as a result of TPI. Responding CDC principals listed meetings with an Assistant Superintendent and consultants (4 principals), divisional programs with all principals, a summer workshop (3 principals), and a review of printed materials (1 principal). CHS principals (4 principals) mentioned systemwide workshops, regional meetings, a summer institute and a two day seminar, mini-workshops, and meetings and briefings between coordinating schools.

Some CDC teachers mentioned a variety of activities, including: briefings and meetings, visits to other career centers, curriculum planning sessions, TPI workshop, TPI orientation, and particular topical sessions. Many CDC teachers, however, left the question of staff development activities unanswered or said it was not applicable to their situation. A review of respondents' questionnaire responses

TABLE 6

CDC AND CHS COUNSELORS' EVALUATIONS OF ASPECTS OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM AT THEIR RESPECTIVE SCHOOLS

Activity	School Type	Agree or Strongly Agree	Disagree or Strongly Disagree	N
1. The present school program offerings are compatible with current employment needs of business and industry.	CDC	100.0%	0.0%	9
	CHS	61.5%	38.5%	13
2. The present school program offerings enable students to acquire marketable skills.	CDC	100.0%	0.0%	9
	CHS	71.4%	28.6%	14
3. The present school offerings enable students to continue their education in post-secondary institutions.	CDC	77.7%	22.3%	9
	CHS	80.0%	20.0%	15
4. The present school offerings enable students to develop leadership skills.	CDC	66.7%	33.3%	9
	CHS	78.5%	21.5%	14
5. The present school program offerings enable students to develop athletic skills.	CDC	14.3%	85.7%	7
	CHS	100.0%	0.0%	14
6. The academic instruction in this school is of the highest quality.	CDC	66.7%	33.3%	6
	CHS	40.0%	60.0%	15
7. The career education instruction in this school is of the highest quality.	CDC	100.0%	0.0%	9
	CHS	38.5%	61.5%	13

does not suggest that there was a systematic, comprehensive, or coordinated series of staff development activities for CDC teachers, at least as perceived or recalled by teachers.

CDC and CHS counselors mentioned such staff development activities as: orientation, staff meetings, consultant lectures, two-day workshops, awareness session, TPI planning retreat, inter-school coordination meetings, TPI committee meetings, recruitment meeting, and a kick-off session. As with teachers, a number of counselors in both settings did not respond to the question.

The six responding CDC Supervising Directors listed a number of staff development activities that they had provided for appropriate personnel. These included meetings and conferences with teachers and students, orientation and topical presentations, workshops, and provision of personnel to assist with TPI areas of planning and implementation that needed more attention. The Supervising Directors also noted that they had received a variety of staff development activities. They considered those activities appropriate and adequate. The activities included conferences, regular meetings, workshops and orientation sessions.

F. Staffing and Support

CDC principals were generally, but not unanimously, inclined to feel that the school system's support for TPI had been adequate. The main criticism was the need for more discussion about problems relating to blocks of time (scheduling coordination).

Two of three responding CHS principals said that more staffing was needed at the CHS to accommodate the needs of shared-time students, especially to assure that they were able to complete their required academic credits.

The responding CDC Supervising Directors believed that the career centers had been adequately staffed. Two of five CDC principals reported they were

receiving program assistance from sources outside the D.C. Public School System. This assistance included funds from partnership agencies.

G. Scheduling

Shared-time students were asked whether they found their schedules difficult to follow. Only 12% of 226 students said "yes". Eighty-eight percent (88%) said "no", they were not difficult to follow. Most of the complaints centered around the need to rush from one place to another and the long school day. For example, several students complained about being marked tardy at the CDC when they were held over at a CHS assembly. Several others complained about not enough time for lunch.

Sixty-eight percent (68%) of the responding CDC students said they preferred the shared-time schedule (½ day and ½ day). Thirty-two percent (32%) said they preferred to be full-time at one school rather than a ½ day at two separate schools.

When listing general problems with the TPI program, students often cited transportation and schedule incompatibility, as well as the early and long hours. Some students were concerned about missing course opportunities either in the CDC or the CHS because of incompatible schedules. Problems with missing busses were mentioned frequently.

Principals, particularly in the comprehensive high schools, also noted continuing concerns about scheduling. They were apt to note adverse impacts on students' abilities to participate in school assemblies and other scheduled AM or PM activities. One principal noted that: "There has been too much student movement from one building to another. Providing adequate class programs to meet all requirements is a major problem. The length of the school day and the scheduling of lunch periods needs some attention. The impact on minor subjects is depressing. The impact on co-curricular activities is and will be a great problem." Students, as noted, echoed these same concerns.

The overall impression is that while following the schedule has not posed a major problem for the majority of students, there is need to continue to examine and rectify those immediate and long-term negative impacts and incompatibilities described here.

H. Academic Performance

How did students in the shared-time program compare in academic performance to those who did not choose, or were not in, the program? Results of analyses bearing on this question are presented in this section.

The number and percent of tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade shared-time (CDC) and non-shared-time (CHS) students passing and failing five major courses in the eight high schools were tabulated. The tabulations were for the Fourth Advisory Period of the 1983-84 school year. The courses were: English, mathematics, science, social studies, and health and physical education. The number of passes and fails in these courses was determined for each school separately. Frequencies were combined across schools to produce the results reported here. They are shown in Table 7.

Statistical tests of the difference in pass-fail rates were made for each course at each grade level by comparing CDC (shared-time students) and CHS (full-time students) distributions.[2/]

1. **Grade Ten.** For every course except social studies, the pass-fail rates of the two groups were significantly different, with the CDC students having a significantly lower rate of fails than the CHS students. The failure rate for social studies was also lower for CDC students, but the difference was not statistically significant for the small numbers compared.

2/ Chi-squared tests were made. Since five tests were made at a given grade level, the level of significance used for each test was .05/5 = .01. That was done to give a Type I error rate of .05 for the grade level. In the majority of the cases, the power of the tests was 80% or more.

TABLE 7

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF CDC (SHARED-TIME) AND CHS (NON-SHARED-TIME) STUDENTS PASSING OR FAILING FIVE REQUIRED COURSES IN THE FOURTH ADVISORY, BY GRADE

Subjects	Grades	Statistic	Shared-Time CDC Students		Full-Time CHS Students	
			Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail
English	10	N	754	239	1,722	819
		%	75.9	24.1	67.8	32.2
	11	N	444	137	1,605	629
		%	76.4	23.6	71.8	28.2
	12	N	312	91	1,681	315
		%	77.4	22.6	84.2	15.8
Mathematics	10	N	420	220	1,507	1,022
		%	65.6	34.4	59.6	40.4
	11	N	126	61	745	527
		%	67.4	32.6	58.6	41.4
	12	N	67	24	278	133
		%	73.6	26.4	67.6	32.4
Science	10	N	357	116	689	639
		%	75.5	24.5	51.9	48.1
	11	N	148	38	624	328
		%	79.6	20.4	65.5	34.5
	12	N	88	28	279	117
		%	75.9	24.1	70.5	29.5
Social Studies	10	N	21	13	129	108
		%	61.8	38.2	54.4	45.6
	11	N	425	148	1,669	667
		%	74.2	25.8	71.4	28.6
	12	N	408	31	2,225	218
		%	92.9	7.1	91.1	8.9
Health/Physical Education	10	N	661	143	1,688	607
		%	82.2	17.8	73.6	26.4
	11	N	18	9	110	69
		%	66.7	33.3	61.5	38.5
	12	N	15	4	56	10
		%	78.9	21.1	84.8	15.2
Total Percentages for all Courses Combined	10	%	75.2	24.8	64.2	35.8
	11	%	74.7	25.3	68.2	31.8
	12	%	83.3	16.7	85.1	14.9

2. **Grade Eleven.** The CDC students had a significantly lower fail rate in science than the CHS students. There were no statistically significant differences for the other four courses; however, the CDC students' failure rates continued to be lower than the CHS students' failure rates.

3. **Grade Twelve.** The CDC students had a significantly higher fail rate in English than the CHS students. The differences for the other four courses were not statistically significant. The CDC failure rates were lower in mathematics, science and social studies, but higher in health/physical education.

These analyses suggest that tenth grade shared-time students outperformed their colleagues who were not in the program in all academic areas except social studies. In that subject, the groups performed comparably. Eleventh and twelth grade students in the shared-time program performed comparably in academic subjects to students who were not in the program, with two exceptions. Eleventh grade shared-time students outperformed their colleagues in science, and twelth grade full-time CHS students outperformed CDC students in English. In general, the academic performance of the CDC students, based on a pass-fail measure, was as good as or better than that of the students who did not participate in the program.

I. Attendance.

Were there different attendance rates between the two groups? The number of absences of CDC and CHS students in the eight high schools was analyzed for the fourth advisory. For each school, grade and course, a determination was made of the number of students with 5 or less absences and the number of students with more than 5 absences. The results of those analyses are shown in Table 8 for the eight schools combined.

Again, chi-squared tests of the statistical significance of differences of distributions were made, using the same criteria used for the pass-fail analyses.

TABLE 8

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF CDC (SHARED-TIME) AND CHS (NON-SHARED-TIME) STUDENTS' ABSENCES IN THE FOURTH ADVISORY, BY COURSE AND GRADE

Subjects	Grade	Statistic	Shared-Time CDC Students		Full-Time CHS Students	
			5 or Less Absences	More Than 5 Absences	5 or Less Absences	More Than 5 Absences
English	10	N	550	443	1,262	1,279
		%	55.4	44.6	49.7	50.3
	11	N	276	311	1,013	1,221
		%	47.0	53.0	45.3	54.7
	12	N	245	156	1,302	679
		%	61.1	38.9	65.7	34.3
Mathematics	10	N	287	353	1,202	1,327
		%	44.8	55.2	47.5	52.5
	11	N	93	94	579	693
		%	49.7	50.3	45.5	54.5
	12	N	52	39	223	190
		%	57.1	42.9	54.0	46.0
Science	10	N	173	300	890	1,059
		%	36.6	63.4	45.7	54.3
	11	N	85	101	453	591
		%	45.7	54.3	43.4	56.6
	12	N	53	74	178	250
		%	41.7	58.3	41.6	58.4
Social Studies	10	N	14	19	100	116
		%	42.4	57.6	46.3	53.7
	11	N	307	266	1,278	1,131
		%	53.6	46.4	53.1	46.9
	12	N	354	85	1,952	491
		%	80.6	19.4	79.9	20.1
Health/Physical Education	10	N	435	369	1,350	945
		%	54.1	45.9	58.8	41.2
	11	N	17	22	89	107
		%	43.6	56.4	45.4	54.6
	12	N	14	7	38	41
		%	66.7	33.3	48.1	51.9
Total Percentages for all Courses Combined	10	%	49.6	50.4	50.4	49.6
	11	%	49.5	50.5	47.7	52.3
	12	%	65.6	34.4	61.7	38.3

1. **Grade Ten.** The shared-time students had significantly fewer absences in English and significantly more absences in science than their CHS colleagues. The two groups had comparable absence rates (as defined and measured here) in mathematics, social studies, and health/physical education.
2. **Grade Eleven.** The absence rates for all five subjects were comparable for the two groups.
3. **Grade Twelve.** The CDC and CHS students in this grade were also comparable in amount of absence in all five subjects.

Thus, only among the tenth grade students were differences in amount of absence from a course significantly different, statistically, between the two groups in the fourth advisory period.

It is possible that an analysis of a wider range of amounts of absence would show more differences between the two groups. The data presented here, however, make the two groups appear quite comparable in overall attendance in classes.

J. Parents' Opinions and Community Involvement

CDC and CHS principals reported a number of methods used to inform parents and the community about the shared-time program. These included PTA and community meetings, newsletters, radio announcements, flyers and brochures, and school newspapers. CDC counselors and teachers also talked to parents about the program.

Questionnaires were distributed through the career centers to 382 parents of shared-time students, and 78 were returned (see Table 1). The parents most frequently indicated that a counselor had been the person from whom they first learned about the program. The next most frequently cited sources of information were the students, followed by teachers and friends. Most of the responding parents (82.7%) believed that sufficient information had been provided to them.

Parents were asked to rate their child's CDC and CHS as poor, good or excellent on several characteristics. While some parents indicated that they did not know or have an opinion about the schools, most of the responding parents did rate the schools. Results for those who did are shown in Table 9. The responding parents' ratings were more positive for the CDC than for the CHS for most of the aspects about which they were asked.

TABLE 9

PARENTS' ASSESSMENTS OF THEIR CHILD'S CDC AND CHS

Aspect	School Type	Rating: Poor	Rating: Good Excellent	N
1. Condition of building	CDC	9.4%	90.6%	64
	CHS	20.6%	79.4%	68
2. Quality of instruction	CDC	3.1%	96.9%	65
	CHS	14.7%	85.3%	68
3. Quality of courses	CDC	1.5%	98.5%	65
	CHS	10.9%	89.1%	52
4. Student guidance and counseling	CDC	17.3%	82.7%	52
	CHS	17.9%	82.1%	56

Parents were also asked their opinion about different aspects of their child's total TPI program. Results are shown in Table 10. Most of the responding parents did not think the program was too rigorous, nor that transportation was a problem.

The majority indicated that the program was approved by the community and that their child was receiving the preparation needed for college and his/her career choice.

TABLE 10

PARENTS' OPINIONS OF THEIR CHILD'S SHARED-TIME PROGRAM

Program Characteristics	Opinions		Number Responding
	Agree to Strongly Agree	Disagree to Strongly Disagree	
1. Courses are too rigorous.	17.4%	82.6%	69
2. Too much homework is asssigned	18.3%	81.7%	71
3. Transportation is a problem.	25.7%	74.3%	74
4. My child is getting the preparation needed for his/her career choice.	87.5%	12.5%	72
5. My child is getting the preparation needed for college.	65.3%	34.7%	72
6. The program is approved by the community.	63.3%	36.7%	60
7. Attending two schools in one day is too rigorous.	14.9%	85.1%	74

Results from responding parents showed little change in frequency of involvement with their children's schools from last year to this year. There was a slightly reduced frequency of conferences with teachers reported for school year 1983-84 compared to the previous year. Participation by their children in the shared-time program did not affect the school involvement of these parents.

The majority of responding parents (about 65%) did not believe their child's school habits and attendance were any better since the child had been in the shared-time program. Parents were about evenly divided as to whether there had been an improved attitude toward school or self on the part of their children. Overall, the majority of the parents (91%) rated the shared-time program as equal or better than the regular academic high school program.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Opinions about and evaluations of a number of aspects of the shared-time program as expressed by a variety of direct and indirect participants have been presented. In so doing, we have often expressed a conclusion that seemed warranted by the particular data. Those conclusions will not be repeated here. Instead, a few overall conclusions that appear justified by the findings reported in the previous chapter are presented.

The shared-time program has attracted students whose academic performance in required subjects was as good as or, especially among tenth graders, better than that of students in the same high schools who did not participate in the program. Furthermore, the attendance at academic classes by the shared-time students was typically comparable to the attendance by their non-shared-tme colleagues.

Although the majority of students found the schedule not difficult to follow, a number did express concerns about sufficient time for lunch, about missing buses, about lack of coordination between the requirements of the CHS and the CDC, about fulfilling their academic requirements, and about the long hours that cut into other school-related activities. Principals, too, especially in the comprehensive high schools, noted continuing concern about scheduling problems. They noted the lunch problem, and the impact of the shared-time program on the opportunities for CDC students to take certain required subjects and to participate in co-curricular activities. There is a need for continued discussion and coordination among administrators, principals, teachers and counselors, both in the CHS and the CDC, around the issue of schedules and the various ripple effects it has produced in a number of areas. Coordination between CDC and CHS personnel needs to be improved.

The modernization program has largely been completed and was seen as successful by various participants. Results presented here suggest that more attention could be paid to equipment, shop and laboratory facilities, and to library facilities in the comprehensive high schools, and to providing updated curriculum documents to CDC teachers. Obtaining adequate supplies was seen as a problem at all schools. Improvement in food facilities is needed especially in the career centers, according to teachers.

Counselors play a number of key roles within the CDC and between the CDC and CHS. They tended to be the most common sources of information about the program to students and to parents. Opinions expressed by students and other participants suggested that there is need for further attention to the counseling services provided in the career centers. Also, counselors in the comprehensive high schools need to put more emphasis on the skills and career training that can be developed in the career centers.

Generally students and teachers had positive opinions about the quality of the course offerings in the CDC. Parents, too, were pleased with them. CDC staff may want to consider providing more opportunities for students to visit course-related work-sites. Relatively few students recalled making such visits very often, if at all.

Results suggested that overall the CDC staffing had been adequate. Some CHS principals believed they needed more staff to accommodate the needs of the shared-time students in the high schools, especially to assure that they could complete their required academic credits. This is one of the ripple effects of the general scheduling problem.

The results of the questionnaires received suggest that more systematic staff development is needed, particularly for teachers and counselors.

Overall, the shared-time (TPI) program appears to be accomplishing its goals. There is a need, however, for more and continuing discussion within

the career centers and comprehensive high schools, and between them, of problems that continue to impact both on the programs and the students in them. Better coordination is needed between the schools to facilitate the effort of the students and the work of the respective staffs. More involvement of or discussion with community groups is also recommended.

APPENDIX A

TRANSITION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

EVALUATION DESIGN

Background

In keeping with the Superintendent's priorities, the District of Columbia Public Schools is implementing the final phases of its Transition Program, a plan for providing essential programs and courses for students completing comprehensive high schools and career centers.

Goal and Objectives

The goal of the Transition Program Implementation (TPI) is to facilitate the integration of vocational education (career development) into the total program of the school system.

In order to achieve the goal of TPI, the following objectives must be accomplished:

1. Identify and activate all system elements responsible for instituting shared-time.
2. Complete modernization of career centers (which includes equipment and furnishings).
3. Develop curriculum and provide staff development for all personnel (administrative, instructional and support).
4. Establish publicity program to provide public awareness of shared-time and insure parental and community involvement.
5. Recruit students and provide guidance and counseling services to students.
6. Staff career centers and comprehensive high schools, recruit and certify personnel.
7. Establish scheduling to facilitate shared-time.

Schools Involved in TPI 1983-84

Career Development Centers (CDC): Bell, Chamberlain, Phelps and M. M. Washington. A status report will be included for Burdick, Ellington and L. Penn.

Comprehensive High Schools (CHS): Anacostia, Cardozo, Dunbar, Eastern, McKinley, Roosevelt and Spingarn.

The Program

Each career center will focus on one of the several clusters of careers in our society. Staff will maintain close ties to business, industry, government and professional institutions. Career centers will provide general and specialized career courses, a flexible pattern of study and extensive cooperative work-study and job sampling programs. A primary objective is to eliminate the concept of the "dropout" and place all students on a career ladder in full-time employment or continuing education.

Students' vocational and technical requirements will be satisfied at the career centers. Academic requirements will be satisfied in the comprehensive high schools. Thus, CDC students will be certified for both the high school diploma and the vocational/technical certificate. To this end students will attend the CDC and CHS on a shared-day plan, one-half day at each school.

Data Variables, Sources, Analyses

Data covering a variety of variables will be gathered throughout the school year 1983-84. Data will be collected from administrators, staff, students, parents and community.

Variables	Sources	Analyses
o Achievement/failures	- Norm-referenced test results (grade 11 and letter grades of CDC students for 1983 and 1984	- Descriptive and tests of significance
o Attendance	- Reports for CDC students for 1983 and 1984	- Descriptive and tests of significance
o Attitudes/opinions	- Questionnaires	- Descriptive
o Counseling services	- Questionnaires and interviews	- Descriptive
o Curriculum/instruction	- Questionnaires and observations	- Descriptive
o Facilities/equipment	- Questionnaires and observations	- Descriptive
o Scheduling	- Questionnaires	- Descriptive
o Staff development	- Questionnaires	- Descriptive
o Staffing	- Questionnaires and observations	- Descriptive
o Support services	- Questionnaires	- Descriptive

Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will answer fourteen basic questions in determining whether the TPI goal and objectives were accomplished.

1. What support has the school system provided for implementing the Transition Program?
2. What made TPI possible?
3. What is the progress of TPI since April, 1982?
4. To what extent has the modernization of career centers been completed?
5. Of what effect was modernization on Career Development Programs?
6. What efforts are made to provide staff development for school system personnel in implementing the Transition Program?

7. To what extent are curriculum documents available for TPI?

8. What are the opinions of students, staff, parents and the community toward TPI?

9. What efforts have been employed/used to make students, staff, parents and the community aware of TPI?

10. To what extent has there been public involvement in TPI?

11. What guidance and counseling services are provided for implementing the Transition Program?

12. How effective are guidance and counseling services for TPI?

13. In order to implement shared-time, what provisions for staffing did the school system arrange?

14. What types of scheduling were developed to establish shared-time?

Evaluation Schedule

Major Tasks	Time Frame
o Pre-planning	September - October 1983
o Development of design and data collection instruments	October - December 1983
o Data Collection	January - June 1984
o Data Analyses	May - July 1984
o Report	June - August 1984

DQA 10/83

TRANSITION PLAN IMPLEMENTATION (TPI)

Evaluation Process

Data Sources	Data Suppliers	Collection Schedules	Evaluation Questions Addressed [1]	TPI Objectives Addressed [1]
Program Plans, Research and Evaluation Documents	Division of Career Development	September 1983 - June 1984	No. 1, 2, 3, 13 & 14	No. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 & 7
Observation/Interview Guide	CDC and CHS Principals, Teachers, Counselors and Students	February 21 - March 16, 1984	No. 1, 4, 8 & 14	No. 2
Interview	Advisory Council Members, Guidance and Counseling Director and Junior High School Principals	February 21 - March 16, 1984	No. 8, 9 & 11	No. 4 & 5
Attendance Reports	DQA, DCD and Regional Offices	February - April 1984	No. 5 & 8	No. 4 & 5
Certification Records	DHRM and DCD	February - April 1984	No. 1 & 13	No. 6
Membership Reports	DQA and DIRM	February - April 1984	No. 5 & 8	No. 4 & 5
Administrator Questionnaire	CDC Administrators	February - April 1984	No. 1, 2, 3, 6, 10 & 14	No. 1, 4, 5, 6 & 7
Counselor Questionnaire	CDC and CHS Counselors	March 26 - April 13, 1984	No. 1, 6, 8, 11 & 12	No. 3, 4 & 5
Parent Questionnaire	Parents of CDC Students	March 26 - April 13, 1984	No. 8 & 9	No. 4
Principal Questionnaire	CDC and CHS Principals	March 26 - April 13, 1984	No. 1, 5, 6, 9, 10 & 13	No. 2, 3, 4, 6 & 7
Student Questionnaire	CDC Students and CHS Tenth Graders	March 26 - April 13, 1984	No. 4, 5, 8, 9 & 11	No. 4
Teacher Questionnaire	CDC and CHS Teachers	March 26 - April 13 1984	No. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11 & 13	No. 3 & 6
Building Renovation Reports	Buildings and Grounds	April - May 1984	No. 1, 3 & 4	No. 2
Student Achievement Results Report	DQA	May - July 1984	No. 5 & 12	No. 3

[1] TPI objectives and evaluation questions are numbered and listed in the evaluation design.

DQA 2/1/84

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION OF THE TRANSITION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION (TPI)

A PRELIMINARY REPORT BASED ON INTERVIEWS AND OBSERVATIONS IN THE SHARED-TIME SCHOOLS

TRANSITION PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION (TPI)

Overview

The evaluation of the Transition Program Implementation (TPI) is being conducted by the Division of Quality Assurance. The purpose of this preliminary report is to present the findings to date. It is hoped that the areas of concern presented at this time will be cause for improvements prior to the end of this school year.

The goal of TPI is to facilitate the integration of vocational education (career development) into the total program of the school system. Two of the critical components of the program called for modernization of the career centers and a shared-time plan whereby students would attend a Career Development Center (CDC) and a Comprehensive High School (CHS) on a half day basis.

This preliminary report is based on observations and interviews in six career centers (Bell, Burdick, Chamberlain, Penn Center, Phelps and M. M. Washington) and eight high schools (Anacostia, Cardozo, Coolidge, Dunbar, Eastern, McKinley, Roosevelt and Spingarn) which form the heart of the shared-time component of TPI.

Interviews were held with a total of twelve principals, two assistant principals, sixteen counselors, twenty-five teachers, and twenty-two students who were on shared-time. Eleven students were interviewed at their CDC and eleven were interviewed at their respective CHS.

Interviews and Observations

Interviews and observations were conducted during the period beginning February 28, 1984 and ending March 13, 1984. Approximately one-half day was spent at each school.

Results of the interviews and observations are presented as answers to five questions which provide the structure for reporting the results.

1. What were the teaching/learning conditions and climate like in the schools?

Disregarding the extensive renovations still going on at some of the schools (both CDC and CHS) the overall environment of the schools appeared safe, clean and conducive to learning. Teachers were about the tasks of instructing and students were orderly and engaged. Renovations that have been completed make the facilities very inviting. The new equipment in the career centers was very impressive.

2. What problems were associated with the teaching/learning conditions and climate in the schools?

a. Renovation of all the career centers has not been completed. One center listed as completed in the Division of Buildings and Grounds report is in need of work on its entrance and main hallway.

b. Some of the CDC new equipment is not in use.

c. Some CDC classes were very small and some schools had few classes. It appeared that attendance was not near the reported enrollment.

3. What are the schedules for shared-time schools and students?

The hours of the career centers were eight to four. As for the eight high schools, three reported hours of nine to three, one reported eight to three, two reported eight-thirty to four and two reported eight to four.

The school day for most students on shared-time is either eight to three or nine to four. The end of an a.m. session at one school and the beginning of a p.m. session at a paired school ranged from eleven-fifteen to twelve-fifty. Most students spend three to four hours in the CDC and two to three hours in the CHS. Some paired schools have gotten together and agreed that tenth graders attend the CDC in the mornings and eleventh and twelfth graders in the afternoon.

Most of the shared-time students are satisfied with their choice and like both their CDC and CHS.

4. What problems were associated with the shared-time schedules?

   a. Tenth graders on shared-time need English, mathematics, P.E. and science, but due to the lack of time in the CHS have to choose three of the four courses.

   b. Shared-time students have difficulty getting in all their academic requirements, making up failures and taking advanced courses in the CHS.

   c. The schools have various bell schedules which cause problems for students using the school buses shuttling between schools. There may also be problems with the buses in bad weather.

   d. Much of the lunch period is used traveling between schools. Students have no relaxation period between CDC and CHS classes and may miss lunch altogether.

   e. Shared-time students do not share in the total CHS program. Many miss the cultural activities and assemblies.

   f. Many ET-15 personnel whose contract calls for an eight-thirty to three-thirty day are still on staff at the career centers, and arrangements have to be made to see that all classes are covered from eight to four.

   g. Three straight hours with only a five to ten minute break in a CDC course can be very taxing on the student and especially taxing on the teacher who has two such sessions during the day.

5. What suggestions were given for improving the program?

   a. There should be more planning and solving of problems by the fourteen schools as a group.

   b. See that all new equipment in the CDC is properly installed and operational.

   c. Cut the CDC schedule by forty minutes and add that time to the student's CHS schedule to enable them to get required academic courses, take advanced courses, and make up failures.

   d. Synchronize the schedules of all schools participating in the shared-time program.